	Case 1:23-cv-01557-NODJ-HBK Docume	ent 16 Filed 02/08/24 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ANTHONY ANDRE SHARP,	Case No. 1:23-cv-01557-NODJ-HBK (HC)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTON FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT
13	v.	(Doc. No. 14)
14	EDWARD BORLA, WARDEN,	(100.110.11)
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	Pending before the Court is Petitioner's motion for default judgment. (Doc. No. 14).	
18	Petitioner is proceeding pro se on a petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.	
19	(Doc. No. 1, "Petition"). Petitioner asks that a judgment be entered in his favor on his Petition	
20	because Respondent did not timely file an Answer to the Petition by the Court's deadline of no	
21	later than 60 days after the November 20, 2023 entry of the Court's order requiring a response to	
22	the Petition. (Doc. No. 14). As a result, Petitioner contends he must be granted resentencing or	
23	immediate release. (<i>Id.</i> at 2).	
24	In general, default judgments are disfavored in habeas corpus cases and a petitioner is	
25	not entitled to a default judgment merely because a respondent may have failed to file an	
26	answer or other response. Gordon v. Duran, 895 F.2d 610, 612 (9th Cir.1990) (stating "[t]he	
27	failure to respond to claims raised in a petition for habeas corpus does not entitle the	
28	petitioner to a default judgment"). Moreover	, as indicated in the Court's November 20, 2023

Order requiring a response to the Petition, Respondent was directed to file either an Answer addressing the merits of the Petition or a motion to dismiss the Petition within the 60-day deadline. (Doc. No. 5 at 1-2). A review of the docket reveals that Respondent timely filed a motion to dismiss on January 19, 2024. (Doc. No. 11). On February 6, 2024, the Court granted Petitioner an extension of time to respond to Respondent's motion to dismiss. (Doc. Nos. 13, 15). Thus, Petitioner's motion based on Respondent's alleged failure to timely file an Answer is without factual basis. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**: Petitioner's motion for default judgment (Doc. No. 14) is DENIED. Dated: February 8, 2024 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 1:23-cv-01557-NODJ-HBK Document 16 Filed 02/08/24 Page 2 of 2